

Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the continued attention to the current application. Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 28, and 30 - 42 were examined. The previously pending claims have been cancelled and replaced with current claims 43 - 70.

Applicant respectfully submits that the current claims are fully supported by the current application as originally filed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the response to previously submitted arguments. Applicant notes that the Examiner's response is dealt with more fully with respect to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Previous claims 1 - 8, 10 - 28 and 30 - 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant notes that the claims have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that the current claims 43 - 70 comply with 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Previous claims 1 - 8, 10 - 28 and 30 - 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta (US Application No. 2002/0131404 A1 to Mehta et al.) in view of Kjellberg (US Application No. 2003/0084165 A1 of Kjellberg) and Krantz (US Application No. 2005/0091357 A1 of Krantz). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the current independent claim 43 recites in part:

receiving the application and associated provisioning instructions, the provisioning instructions specifying provisioning operations to be performed;

determining one or more application programming interfaces (APIs) required to perform the provisioning instructions, each of the one or more APIs defining an interface for an API enabler to access an associated content type;

retrieving one or more API enablers, each API enabler implementing a respective API and providing functionality required to provision the application

The current claims clarify that an application is associated with provisioning instructions which can specify provisioning operations that are provided by APIs defining an interface for an API enabler to access an associated content type. Once it is determined what APIs are required by the provisioning operations, API enablers are retrieved that implement the respective APIs. The provisioning instructions can then be executed, with the provisioning operations utilizing the API enablers to provide the functionality required.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teachings of Mehta, Kjellberg and Krantz fail to suggest the subject matter of the current claims. The combined teachings fail to provide, or even consider, the ability to provision an application with provisioning instructions that can utilize one or more APIs implemented by respective API enablers. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that current claims 43 - 56 comply with 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Applicant respectfully submits that current independent claims 56 and 70 recite similar limitations to those of current independent claims 43. Applicant respectfully submits that current claims 56 - 70 comply with 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Closing

In view of the amendments, remarks and having dealt with all of the rejections raised by the Examiner, reconsideration and allowance of the current application is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark sprigings/

Mark Sprigings

Registration No. 56,626

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP

160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600

Ottawa, Ontario

Canada K1P 1C3

(613) 233-1781